UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS

NEW ENGLAND DISTRICT

In the Matter of:

PUBLIC HEARING:

RE: DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

CAPE WIND ENERGY PROJECT

NANTUCKET SOUND, MASSACHUSETTS

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers 696 Virginia Road Concord, Massachusetts

Tuesday January 11, 2005

The above entitled matter came on for hearing, pursuant to adjournment at 4:00 p.m.

BEFORE:

Larry Rosenberg, Moderator Chief, Public Affairs

Karen Adams, Chief Permits and Enforcement Branch

267 I N D E X PANEL PAGE Larry Rosenberg, Chief Public Affairs New England District U.S. Army Corps of Engineers 268 Karen Adams, Chief Permits and Enforcement Branch New England District U.S. Army Corps of Engineers 268 SPEAKERS: **PAGE** David Gordon 270 272 Bryan Sheehan Herbert Baker 275 Michele Sprengnether 277 Scott Greenbaum 280 William Frantzen 281 284 Diana Duffley Mary Clifford 287 Nina Danforth 288 Seth Itzkan 291

PROCEEDINGS

(4:00 p.m.)

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Good evening, and welcome to the continuation of the United States Army Corps of Engineers' National Environmental Policy Act public hearing on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Cape Wind Energy Project that was held at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, MIT, Room 10-250, at 77 Massachusetts Avenue in Cambridge, Massachusetts, and was recessed approximately 11:30 p.m. as a result of the imposed time restrictions by the institution.

Our Hearing Officer this evening is
Mrs. Karen Adams who is also the project manager
for the Cape Wind EIS. So, ladies and gentlemen,
Mrs. Adams.

MS. ADAMS: Thank you. This hearing is being held as part of the Corps of Engineers' review under Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act and the National Environmental Policy Act. We are seeking comment on the draft environmental impact statement for the Cape Wind Energy Project that will lead to a decision by the federal

government on a permit application submitted by
Cape Wind Associates for their proposal to build a
wind energy project in Nantucket Sound,
Massachusetts.

I would like to re-emphasize that the Corps of Engineers has made no decision with regard to this permit. It is our responsibility to fully evaluate the proposed activity and its impacts prior to our decision.

The hearing is now reconvened to provide an opportunity to those people who signed up to speak at the December 16th hearing but were not called due to the time constraint.

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: If there's no objection from the Hearing Officer, I will not repeat the administrative information that was presented at the MIT hearing as this is part of that hearing and all the protocol and rules established and applied at that hearing will remain in effect.

MS. ADAMS: That's good. Thank you.

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you.

The hearing this evening will be conducted in a manner that all who desire to

express their views will be given an opportunity to do so. A transcript of this hearing as you can see is being prepared, and the record will remain open and written comments may be submitted tonight or by mail until February 24th, 2004. Now, all comments receive equal consideration.

Individuals speaking this evening will be called to the microphone in the order they signed in. Now, as this is a continuation of the MIT hearing, it is requested that you limit -- you try to limit your remarks to the previously established two-minute window. Please identify if you're speaking for or representing a position of an organization. If you speak for yourself, please, just say so.

First individual to provide comment for the record is David Gordon.

DAVID GORDON: Have to go up there?

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Anywhere you want.

We'll try to keep it as informal as possible.

DAVID GORDON: I'm David Gordon and I'm a retired instrument engineer, technician, inventor, and I'm no relation to Jim Gordon of Cape Wind. And what I'm here about is this wind

farm project is basically a money-driven project and it's an antiquated, obsolete, unsightly, navigational and aerial hazard. What the general public doesn't know is that there's a much better solution to our energy needs, and that is hydrogen power. Of course, we all know and read in the paper about hydrogen power through fuel cells and what they don't know about it is hydrogen power on demand, which is called HOD, and that's been going on since 1935, Garrett's Gadgets, you can find that in your computer. They've actually run a car on it, put water in it instead of gasoline, and it's really nothing more than water electrolysis.

And along that 70-year period or so, this water electrolysis has evolved along with other technologies.

Hydrogen power is the only solution to our energy independence, and the reason for that is because, to give an example, it's not just Nantucket Sound that's involved here, we have terrorist threats now, Bin Ladin and his thugs come over here and start bombing our refineries and facilities, we'd find ourselves on an economic downfall. They say that going to this way on

hydrogen power would also do that, but there would be a much less economic quagmire.

But what I say basically is if we look at the option on hydrogen power as our future energy independence instead of wind power, which is obsolete, it's a great source for sailing and that kind of thing, but it's not going to solve our energy problem; hydrogen power will.

That's all I have to say. I hope we can do it now.

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, sir. Thank you very much.

Next speaker, Bryan Sheehan.

BRYAN SHEEHAN: My name is Bryan Sheehan from Southborough, Massachusetts, speaking for myself, not on behalf of any organization, and no ties to Cape Wind.

First of all I want to thank you for having this follow-up hearing as well and the commitments to the dedication of the detail that's been gone through so far.

Just a -- first a comment about hydrogen power. My limited understanding of hydrogen power is that it requires some other energy source to do

electrolysis and hopefully we will not have to get that energy power from fossil fuel sources.

The significant benefits of the Cape
Wind project have been well stated in the draft
survey environmental statement as well as by many
people at the hearings in Cambridge and I'm sure
we'll hear tonight, and devastating impacts of
continued dependence on polluting and finding of
fossil fuels are so well established as to need to
further comment, so, I'd like to address some of
the objections which appear to be behind all of
the various negative comments about this project.
Most of them have to do with presumably damaging a
pristine wilderness and hindering views and
property values.

In response to those who would have those claims, I would emphasize that the decisions we make now and the rest of this decade will determine whether we leave our children a healthy and safe world or a polluted and irreversibly damaged one. We must admittedly remain vigilant about preserving the Earth's beautiful places, but also must weigh the alternatives and look beyond self-interests. We must not view a selected sight

with an exaggerated sense of its purity. I'm as interested as anyone in preserving our great remaining wilderness places. While we must agree on that, we must agree that Nantucket Sound is not a pristine wilderness, but rather a beautiful but already human-impacted area in which commercial and recreational boating, commercial fishing, and lobstering already take place.

About the appearance of these wind turbines, I'm sure anyone who's seen the ugliness of an oil spill or a mountaintop mining operation would say that not only are wind turbines beautiful in their own right, or beautiful by comparison, but in their own right, they've been called the breeze made visible and have a sculptural beauty not only in their physical form but for what they stand for, beautiful pieces potentially of modern sculpture quietly turning, symbolizing a new, renewable energy freedom that we can be proud of, taking us to a future and at the same time connecting us to our past when people lived closer to the natural world.

We must ensure that this project is established in a way that's as minimally invasive

as possible to the natural environment and to the views, but we must not allow such minimal potential downsides, especially compared to the potential destruction of continued fossil fuel dependence to hinder the project.

The state, nation and world are at a crossroads when something must be done, and we once again in Massachusetts have a chance to lead this country to a new form of independence, and that is independence from foreign oil.

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, sir. Thank you very much.

Next speaker, Herbert Baker.

HERBERT BAKER: Thank you. And again, thank you for -- I was at the MIT hearing and I appreciate being able to speak.

My name is Herb Baker. I live in

Lexington, Massachusetts. Up until this past June

I was an administrator for the Belmont Public

Schools for 33 years in the area of social

studies. I currently teach at Simmons College in

history, and my career in history and passion for

it over the past 33 years has led to many studies

in the area of the environment, and I'm fully

aware of alternative sources of energy being necessary in the future.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

In addition to that, I have a son who is a Captain in the Army and just recently served one year in Iraq, and I think that you will agree that certainly part of our reason for being in that area was our dependency on fossil fuel. So, clearly I'm an advocate of alternative sources of energy.

My concerns are two: one, the first concern I have is the fact that the company that's currently involved in making the proposition apparently has no experience whatsoever in this field, and that frightens me. Two, my understanding is is that the site, and even the people who are opposed to the wind farms will agree that the site if placed offshore would be acceptable to both sides, and the reason why I guess the current company is unwilling to go offshore is because they claim that the technology simply isn't there, when there is compelling evidence that in Europe currently there are several sites off the coast of Great Britain that are in a similar environmental habitat.

So, for those two reasons, plus also my desire that I hope the Army Corps of Engineers moves slowly on this and does a lot of reflection and digesting of the facts on both sides, and I hope that the Army Corps of Engineers does not make a hasty decision on this.

Again, thank you for your time.

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, sir.

Next speaker, Michele S-p-r-e-
Could you please pronounce?

MICHELE SPRENGNETHER: Sprengnether.

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you.

MICHELE SPRENGNETHER: I want to thank
you for allowing people in the Greater Boston area
to voice their support for the Cape Wind Project.
And I'm here tonight as an active member of the
Massachusetts Interfaith for Power and Light
organization. You heard from our co-founder back
at MIT.

We work with congregations of every faith to increase environmental stewardship, promoting energy efficiency and renewable energy within building facilities, and also within member households and congregation communities at large.

Massachusetts Interfaith for Power and Light supports the need for more new renewable electricity in Massachusetts such as that offered by the Cape Wind Project. New renewable electricity is one of the most important ways that we can reduce our state's greenhouse gas emissions. In support of these efforts, I have worked for the past three years to reduce my family's and my church's carbon dioxide emissions, and I agree with Governor Romney on one thing: we have to act now to reduce our greenhouse gases rather than risk the wait to see how great a burden we leave our children due to inaction. And besides, we can financially afford to do something.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

But I want to tell you from my personal experience, I've applied insulation, the light bulbs have been converted to compact fluorescent, all of my appliances are Energy Star, my car trips are cut down, but the single largest reduction of CO2 emissions realized for either an historic church or for a three-decker in Cambridge is from the purchase of new renewable electricity. So, for the past two years I have offset my household

CO2 emissions with the purchase of green tags, which you might have heard of, not coming 99 percent from wind energy on the West Coast through Bonneville Environmental Foundation. This coming year I plan to purchase local new renewable electricity because of the Massachusetts

Technology Collaborative's matching grant offer that assists cities and low-income households.

However, I'm going to be paying nearly three times more for East Coast new renewables as I have for that on the West Coast. In Massachusetts, we have a shortage of renewables, and in fact, we have a shortage of electricity in general, and we have and must import a significant from other states and Canada.

New England is behind many other areas of the country in developing renewable electricity, and our need for more power is great, and for those reasons I support the Cape Wind Project because it will help meet our need for more clean electricity.

Thank you for your time.

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, Ma'am.

Next speaker, Scott Greenbaum.

APEX Reporting (617) 426-3077

23

24

SCOTT GREENBAUM: Good evening. Greenbaum, energy project development engineer, self-employed. I'm not representing anybody I have looked at this project and except myself. I think it's a very admirable project, it should be economically feasible, it should be economically viable for the entire region. many pollution attributes and everything else that we've heard about in previous meetings. I heard at the last meeting a lot of people discussing the negative aspects of bird kills and fish kills and potentials there and I didn't hear anything about the effect that the reduced pollution will have on these animals and that the net effect may be a positive even though, you know, for the wildlife as well as for human beings due to lower pollution. And I don't know whether the study currently illustrates that. I doubt that there's any statistical information that you can put into it quantifying these positives for the animal population, but I'd love to see that in the project. I'd love to see the project go forward. The speaker before said that there's potential for offshore wind in deeper water.

is obviously a more expensive, more difficult project to do, and I hope that in future that a similar project is up in front of you to add the wind and renewable energy over the area, because this region needs to become more independent fuel sourced than it is today because we as a region import almost all our energy, there is natural gas, oil, hydro from Canada or somewhere else, and there is very little generated within the New England region that is usable, that we can generate ourselves, and anytime you generate your own energy you improve your economic status and that would definitely improve the lives of everyone in the area.

Thank you very much.

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, sir.

Next speaker, William Frantzen. Did I say that correctly?

WILLIAM FRANTZEN: Yes. Frantzen.

Thank you for this extra meeting. I think we all appreciate being heard. My name is Bill Frantzen from Framingham, Massachusetts.

The reason why we are here taking up our valuable time with this emotion, this commotion,

is not because of the debate, renewable versus fossil; it is because of location. Make no mistake about it, location. I'm amazed that this pristine location has received this much consideration. It is so very wrong. people who want wind energy, you should be angry, very angry. You should be upset that such a controversial location was knowingly chosen just for private gain. Many people want wind energy, not controversy or a black cloud. This location was chosen due to brazen greed. Do you care if Jim Gordon pockets one hundred and fifty million or two hundred and fifty million, if it's offshore maybe a hundred and fifty million? What category would you place a person if a hundred and fifty million dollars were not enough? Greedy? Remember, your anger should be directed to the choice of this location. It's getting in the way of progress. Your wishes may come true if the proper location is chosen offshore. To the people who oppose, you're absolutely correct: you don't industrialize the Grand Canyon or Yosemite. comparison is correct. Millions of people per year visit the islands. Cape Wind's not in my

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

back yard ploy -- not in my back yard was a smart ploy. However, it is just a small factor. Ferries, boats, planes, travel indisputedly to one of the best locations in the world. Look at the clientele in the islands. You can go anywhere -- they can go anywhere in the world but they come here because it is world class.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

It is still, in my opinion, beyond belief that this proposal has received this much consideration as a possibility. The first things that any of us see when we travel to the Cape are the bridges. The bridges are our icons, that they mark world class Cape Cod and the islands. the Army Corps of Engineers to not blemish their reputation. Remember the compelling remarks from all those who love the sound. From the Cambridge meeting, the cons hit home with more than -- more than those of the people who want the windmills. Some people are caught up in the renewable versus fossil. We can all win with the correct location and this location again was chosen because Jim Gordon doesn't want to back off from his profit margin. My gut feeling when all is considered is that we don't have to worry because the Army Corps

is a top-notch organization that will make the correct decision.

Thank you.

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, sir.

Next speaker, Diana Duffley.

DIANA DUFFLEY: Hi. My name is Diana

Duffley, and I've lived on Cape Cod for most of my

life and I own property in Centerville with views

of Nantucket Sound. At first I was very skeptical

and fearful and tried to remain passive about this

issue, but I struggled for about a year-and-a-half

before personally endorsing the project. The wind

farm is a clean image for Cape Cod: clean beaches,

clean air, clean energy. It just goes together.

I think they can co-exist quite beautifully.

I traveled to Denmark in January of 2004 to see a first hand an ocean-based wind farm. The Danes on the positive aspect of the wind farm: property values had only increased, tourism was booming, and the birds were still flying. One big concern for them was the legacy that they were going to leave their children. Leaving a cleaner world: priceless. I was pleasantly surprised on how the towers were just silhouetted on the

horizon. They didn't obliterate it, and they appeared slender, quiet, and the movement was very graceful.

When in Denmark, looking out over the ocean at the wind park, there was one big thing missing, though: there was a smoke stack. Being so dependent on fossil fuel is very unbalanced. I think the wind will set us free if we can just give it a chance.

Finally, it would be selfish and shallow to decide based on how it would affect my view of the sound. To me, that's ethically irresponsible. I think the Cape can move forward into the future and be environmental leaders in this area.

I am also a member of the Chamber of Commerce and own a business in Hyannis, and I can't believe that they can't see the image for Cape Cod would be -- that we would be environmental leaders, and this project should not be blocked. I really hope it goes forward.

Thank you.

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, Ma'am.

That's all I have in the way of cards.

Is there anybody here that would like to provide

1 some comment? Now, we're going to be here for 2 some time this evening, if and when others show, but if there's anybody here that would like to --3 4 if you haven't already spoke but would like to add 5 something on the record, this is your opportunity. 6 If not, we'll take a recess until somebody else 7 comes. 8 DAVID GORDON: We're going to have an 9 open discussion maybe? 10 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Well, we'll hang around and talk, but there'll be nothing on the 11 12 record. 13 DAVID GORDON: I'd like to make a 14 comment. 15 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Is there anybody 16 who has not spoke? Okay. So, Karen, if it's 17 okay, we'll recess until somebody comes in. 18 MS. ADAMS: Sure. 19 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Okay. So, this 20 hearing is now in recess. 21 (Recess.) 22 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Ladies and 23 gentlemen, we'll reconvene. Our next speaker,

24

Mary Clifford.

MARY CLIFFORD: My name is Mary Clifford and I am a Cape Cod resident representing myself. My family has been on Cape Cod since 1955. Thank you for giving me this opportunity to speak with you here tonight.

My concerns are threefold:
environmental, aesthetics, and economics. What
would be the impact environmentally of a runaway
barge that hit one or more turbines at such time
40,000 gallons of dialectic oil would spill, this
chemically treated oil that is environmentally
hazardous? If a hurricane were to knock down one
or more turbines, creating an oil spill, who will
take the responsibility for the environmental
impact? During this installation and tearing up
the ocean floor, how much oil would be spilled
into Nantucket Sound?

President Bush formed a cabinet-level committee on ocean policy in December '04.

Federal regulation and marine laws are still being established on the subject of wind farms and the ocean. Iowa has proven to be a successful location for a wind farm. Studies of the impact on birds and federally protected wildlife yield

1 inconclusive results at this time.

Lastly, the Beacon Hill Institute at Suffolk University did a study finding that there would be a \$1.3 billion decline in Cape Cod real estate values. Tourism would lose up to \$203 million per year, thereby diminishing the town taxes at least \$8 million.

Thank you for your considerations.

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, Ma'am. And we are back at recess. Thank you.

(Recess.)

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: We're back. Our next speaker, Nina Danforth.

NINA DANFORTH: My name is Nina

Danforth. Members of my family have been on

Nantucket for four generations and we have run a

successful family business, a bed and breakfast,

for two decades. We all care a lot about what

happens in the Sound and to tourists who visit

from all over the world, and when we heard about

the planned turbines, we were very wary about the

project from the point of view of quality of life

and quality of visit, so, I decided to learn more.

APEX Reporting

First, I went to a workshop at MIT last

fall and I found out more about the layout of the turbines, that it's planned primarily for the shoals where ferries and tourist boats could not go anyway. Wave action is lower on the Sound, so, erecting and operating the turbines is less hazardous, I found out, in the Sound, whereas putting up wind farms in the open ocean and any other place along our coast would be probably too costly and also too dangerous for workers.

Lastly, I saw on the plans that there's a very wide-open swath for the ferries to pass, so, I can't imagine any situation where ferry passengers would be in danger.

Myself. I didn't know anything about the other groups that spoke last time, but I spoke with quite a few Danes as I went to parts of the coast to take a look, and I found nothing but enthusiasm and confidence about the towers. To my amazement, I couldn't find any complaints. Instead, I heard of pride in their non-polluting power, pride in self-sufficiency, and an increase in tourism from curious admirers around the world, which is great for our business. If there's more tourists, the

more we'll succeed in Massachusetts.

So, I saw lines of towers extending out towards Sweden and disappearing into the distance, the closest ones changing from gray to white when the sun came out, but slender, quiet, and sculptural on the horizon.

I came home to Boston thinking that we can accept this new technology when we begin to see it in a new light. To the Danes, wind power is part of their life and part of their society. They have turbines on their farms to pump water and light in their homes. They have wind farms on both coasts and just three miles off of busy Copenhagen Harbor. Quality of life there is high and tourism is thriving.

Our topography and stormy oceans will not allow us to have so many wind farms here in Massachusetts as they do per capita, so, it seems to me that if we do have a situation on one part of our coast where wind power will work, then we should get behind it.

Lastly, I just want to share with you that as you look out to sea, wind turbines are visible on a clear day and are they a steel forest

1 like some people say? Well, maybe, if you want to 2 see it that way, but I prefer to think of them as I look out as -- about as big as my thumb and 3 4 that's just about how they look when you hold your 5 hand up against the horizon. So, check it out. Next time you're on the coast, that's what you do; 6 7 you hold up your thumb to see how big they are, the closest ones, and so, I hope we can keep our 8 9 thumbs up for this project. 10 Thanks. 11 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, Ma'am. 12 Seth Itzkan. 13 SETH ITZKAN: Give me one minute to 14 relax. 15 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Please, take your 16 time. (Discussion off the record.) 17 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: We're back from 18 19 Next speaker, Steth Itzkan. recess. 20 SETH ITZKAN: Seth. 21 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Seth Itzkan. 22 SETH ITZKAN: First of all, I want to 23 say it's a pleasure to be here tonight.

Massachusetts, the harbinger of innovation for

24

America and much of the world, it's thus appropriate that this is the state that considers the future of offshore wind power in the United States, and I want to first salute the Army Corps of Engineers for their extraordinary job and thoroughness, and the fact that we even can have this meeting tonight is an example of that and I appreciate it.

My name is Seth Itzkan; I'm a board member of the Greater Boston Chapter of the World Future Society, which is a worldwide organization of individuals concerned about trends affecting the future of humanity. The Greater Boston chapter is particularly interested in trends affecting the future of the Massachusetts area, Greater Boston and New England.

Although I'm representing myself tonight, I believe I speak for all my colleagues when I say that the Cape Wind is an important project for the safe and sustainable future of energy. As many of you know, the fossil fuel paradigm is coming to an end and we need to find long term sustainable alternatives, and as long as there is sun and an atmosphere, there will be

wind.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

I just want to share some personal experience. This summer I went to the Mittengrunden Offshore Wind Farm in Copenhagen which was in 2000 the world's largest offshore wind farm at the time. It is 20 turbines of two megawatts each, creating a total of 40 megawatts. By today's standards, that's already quite small. The proposed Cape Wind Project is ten times that, more, more so. The Mittengrunden project was met with huge success in Copenhagen and is currently providing about four percent of that city's power. Four percent may not sound like much, but if you think about it, in an eight-hour day, that's about 20 minutes, so, you could figure that at 4:40 in the afternoon from a 9:00 to 5:00 day, if you turned off all the power from all other sources, you would continue to have 20 minutes worth of power for your computer, refrigerators and PCs and everything else coming from these 20 turbines in the harbor.

This is an extraordinary opportunity for New England to be able to have as much as 470 megawatts of power, which is equivalent to peak

load for Cape and the Islands. If something were to happen to the other sources of power, such as coal and nuclear, we would continue to have power here. It's also, of course, safer and less of a threat.

Finally, I would like you to consider that 450, 470 megawatts, which is planned for this, is about equivalent to one-third of a nuclear power plant, and if there were three times this capacity, that would be a whole nuclear -- one whole nuclear power plant we could do without. And in Germany they are planning to have as much as 25 megawatts of power by 2025. That's 25 megawatts of wind power by 2025. That's the equivalent of 15 nuclear power plants that they won't have to have because they'll be on wind. So, I think I'm all in favor of this. This is an extraordinary, positive opportunity for Massachusetts and the New England area.

MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, sir. And we're back at recess.

(Recess.)

MS. ADAMS: We have heard many thoughtful statements and a careful analysis will

be required before a determination can be made and a decision rendered. Written statements may be submitted to the Corps of Engineers until February 24, 2005. They will receive equal consideration with those presented tonight and with those presented at MIT on December 16, 2004. Each question or issue raised will be addressed in the Final Environmental Impact Statement.

We at the Corps of Engineers extend our appreciation to all who tool the time to involve themselves in this public review process to provide us with your thoughts, your comments and your concerns.

Thank you and goodnight.

(Whereupon, at 8:00 p.m. on January 11, 2005, the above matter was concluded.)

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER AND TRANSCRIBER

This is to certify that the attached proceedings

in the Matter of:

RE: DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

CAPE WIND ENERGY PROJECT

NANTUCKET SOUND, MASSACHUSETTS

Place: Concord, Massachusetts

Date: January 11, 2005

were held as herein appears, and that this is the true, accurate and complete transcript prepared from the notes and/or recordings taken of the above entitled proceeding.

<u>Jeffrey Mocanu</u>
Reporter

<u>January 11, 2005</u>
Date

Meredith Bruce January 31, 2005

Transcriber Date

APEX Reporting (617) 426-3077